REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 8, 10 and 17 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. Claims 18-24 have been added. Support for the new claims is as follows. Support for new Claim 18 is provided by, for example, Examples 1 and 3 of the application. Support for new Claim 19 is provided by, for example, page 10 of the specification, lines 2-3. Support for new Claim 20 is provided by, for example, Example 1. Support for new Claim 21 is provided by, for example, page 9 of the specification, lines 8-10. Support for new Claim 22 is provided by, for example, Example 3. Support for new Claim 23 is provided by, for example, page 12 of the specification, lines 8-12. Support for new Claim 24 is provided by, for example, page 8 of the specification, lines 23-24. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, entry of the new claims is requested.

Claims 1-8 and 10-17 have again been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldo et al. or Forrest in view of Egusa et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

The Examiner states that Baldo *et al.* disclose light-emitting devices comprising a glass substrate, an anode, an organic compound layer including a light-emitting layer containing two light-emitting materials. Applicant submits that Baldo *et al.* disclose a light-emitting layer containing only one light-emitting material. CBP serves as host material in Baldo *et al.* CBP is a blue emissive material but there is no emission about 400 nm from the devices (*see*, page 4, left column, line 9 from the bottom and Fig. 4). There is no disclosures in Baldo *et al.* that teaches or suggests that the disclosure therein can be modified so as to arrive at a white light-emitting device comprising the two or more different light-emitting materials.

Baldo et al. also disclose light-emitting devices with green emission (see, page 4, left column of second paragraph), but do not disclose or suggest the white light-emitting device of the present invention. Baldo et al. teaches that blue emission from CBP is negligible (see, page 6, left column of second paragraph). Baldo et al. teaches away from providing a device comprising two or more different light-emitting materials.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been *prima facie* obvious for one of ordinary skill to arrive at the light-emitting device of the present Claim 1 based upon Baldo *et al.* alone and as will be discussed below, in combination with the secondary references.

The Examiner states that Forrest *et al.* disclose light-emitting devices comprising a glass substrate, an anode, an organic compound layer including a light-emitting layer/zone containing three light emitting materials, and a cathode. Forrest *et al.* may disclose a red-emitting OLED using a phosphorescent sensitizer molecule to excite a fluorescent material, via energy transfer from a phosphorescent sensitizer to DCM, and a phosphorescent sensitizer is a orthometallated complex (*see*, column 7, line 2 and column 9, line 33) as described in the first embodiment.

However, regarding the orthometallated complex, Forrest *et al.* teaches that the mechanism is a long-range, non-radiative energy transfer from the phosphor to the fluorescent dye (*see*, column 7, line 2). Thus, Forrest *et al.* teaches away from emission (radiation) from a orthometallated complex.

Therefore, Applicants also respectfully submit that it would not have been *prima facie* for one of ordinary skill to arrive at the light-emitting device of the present Claim 1 based upon the teachings of Baldo *et al.* and/or Forrest *et al.*

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

U.S. Appln. No. 09/845,356

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that, as previously discussed (see, the Rule 111

· Amendment filed November 22, 2002), the invention of Egusa et al. is clearly not directed to a

orthometallated complex.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 32,607

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

Date: April 10, 2003

6

APPENDIX

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

The claims are amended as follows:

- 8. (Twice Amended): The white light-emitting device as claimed in claim 1, wherein the at least one light-emitting layer contains a host material selected from the group consisting of carbazole, oxazole, oxadiazole, imidazole, polyarylalkane, pyrazoline, pyrazolone, phenylenediamine, arylamine, amino-substituted chalcone, styrylanthracene, fluorenone, hydrazone, stilbene, silazane, aromatic tertiary amine compounds, styrylamine compounds, aromatic dimethylidene compounds, porphyrin compounds, anthraquinodimethane, anthrone, diphenylquinone, thiopyran dioxide, carbodiimide, fluorenylidenemethane, distyrylpyradine, tetracarboxylic acid anhydrides of aromatic rings, phthalocyanine, metal complexes of 8-quinolinol, metal phthalocyanine, metal complexes containing as a ligand benzoxazole or benzothiazole, polysilane compounds, electrically conductive oligomers selected from the group consisting of poly(N-vinylcarbazole), aniline copolymers, thiophene oligomer and polythiophene, polythiophene, polyphenylene, polyphenylene, and polyfluorene.
- 10. (Twice Amended): The white light-emitting device as claimed in claim 1, wherein the two or more different light-emitting materials are three light emitting materials that include a blue light-emitting material having a light-emitting wavelength peak in the range of 400 to 500 nm, an orthometallated complex as a green light-emitting material having a light-emitting wavelength peak in the range of 500 to 470 570 nm, and a red light-emitting material having a light-emitting wavelength peak in the range of 580 to 670 nm.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 U.S. Appln. No. 09/845,356

17. (Amended): The white-light emitting device as claimed in claim 16, wherein the green light-emitting material have has a light-emitting wavelength peak in the range of 500 to 570 nm.

Claims 18-24 are added as new claims.